

Remarks/Arguments

1. In the Specification Applicant has amended the title, as suggested by the Examiner, and has amended Paragraph [0023] to correct a typographical error.

2. Claims 2-6, 8-10, 12-14, and 16-18 were rejected under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. 112 for failing to comply with the written description. Insofar as this rejection might be applied to the claims now in the application, it is respectfully traversed.

Regarding claims 2 and 12, the Specification does not support the claim language that the axle bracket has a hole therethrough.... This was an accurate observation, so Applicant has amended the claims to recite the "support arm" and the fact that it has the hole therethrough.

Regarding claims 8 and 16, the recitation of "elongated" couplers was not supported in the Specification. Applicant has amended the claims to eliminate use of the term "elongated".

The remainder of the section 112 rejections were based on typographical errors and oversights. Applicant has amended the various claims as outlined in the Office Action.

3. Claims 1 and 11 were rejected under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. 102 as being anticipated by Van Ryswyk. Insofar as this rejection might be applied to the claims now in the application, it is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1 and 11 both recite that the ramp is "flat table-like" and that "the kick given by the kicker is the primary impetus for bale ejection". Neither of these limitations can be found exactly or even remotely suggested by Ryswyk, because Ryswyk ejects the bale by a powered conveyor, not a kicker.


4. The drawings were objected to for not showing every limitation in the claims. More particularly, the drawings were objected to for not showing the frame and the elongated couplers. Applicant has amended the appropriate claims to eliminate reference to a frame and an "elongated" coupler, so this rejection should be moot. The claims have not suffered loss due to these changes, because the frame is not a necessary recitation and the couplers are not necessarily "elongated".

5. In summary, claims 1-5, 7-13, and 15-18 have been amended, and claims 1-18 remain in the application. Applicant submits that all rejections have been overcome, and respectfully requests that they be withdrawn and that the application be allowed.

Pursuant to currently recommended Patent Office practice, the Examiner is expressly authorized to call Applicant's attorney, collect, at Lancaster, Pennsylvania, if in his judgment disposition of this application could be expedited or if he considers the application ready for final disposition by other than allowance.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: August 26, 2005



John B. Mitchell
Reg. No. 26,485
Customer No. 25,542
Attorney for CNH America LLC
Phone: 717.314.2844